



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/731,882

12/09/2003

James Rohl

279.630US1

6739

21186

7590

05/15/2008

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.

P.O. BOX 2938

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHONG H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/15/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/731,882	Applicant(s) ROHL ET AL.	
	Examiner PHONG H. NGUYEN	Art Unit 3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-12 and 53-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 53-56 and 58-63 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-12, 57 and 64-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 10, 12 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsubota (5,361,660).

Tsubota discloses placing sheet A between punch 3 and die 7, 11; die hole is in the center of element 7, through which punch 3 passes; delivering lubricant via element 21 as shown in figure 1; actuating the punch as shown in figure 2; the element A in figure 2, which is shown passing through elements 7 and 11 is considered to be an electrode layer for a flat capacitor; sheet is aluminum as disclosed in column 4, line 31; aluminum sheets inherently have an aluminum oxide portion due to the sheets exposure to air as evidenced by Frank et al (2,854,074) in column 1, line 27-29; the portions of the aluminum sheet that are exposed to air and have aluminum oxide on them are considered to be distinct portions; the aluminum portion of the sheet is considered to be a distinct aluminum portion; the lubricant is concentrated on the periphery of the die hole where the punch cuts through the aluminum portion as shown in figure 1, and each location about the periphery of the die hole is considered to be a specific location on the periphery of the die hole.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tsubota in view of Klint et al (3,288,715), hereafter Klint.

Tsubota discloses everything as noted above, but does not disclose delivering a partially fluorinated fluid, however, Klint teaches delivering a partially fluorinated fluid in column 2, lines 2-4.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to deliver a partially fluorinated fluid in Tsubota as taught by Klint in order to obtain a bright surface on the fabricated aluminum.

5. Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tsubota in view of 3M.

Tsubota discloses everything, but the partially fluorinated fluid is not Fluorinert fluid, however, 3M teaches the advantages of delivering Fluorinert fluid.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to deliver a Fluorinert fluid in Tsubota and Klint as taught by 3M in order to use a lubricant that does not contribute to ground-level smog formation.

6. Claims 65 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tsubota in view of Lyon (2,821,156).

Regarding claims 65 and 67, Tsubota discloses placing sheet A between punch 3 and die 7, 11; die hole is in the center of element 7, through which punch 3 passes; delivering lubricant via element 21 as shown in figure 1; actuating the punch as shown in figure 2; the element A in figure 2, which is shown passing through elements 7 and 11 is considered to be an electrode layer for a flat capacitor; sheet is aluminum as disclosed in column 4, line 31; aluminum sheets inherently have an aluminum oxide portion due to the sheets exposure to air as evidenced by Frank et al (2,854,074) in column 1, line 27-29; the portions of the aluminum sheet that are exposed to air and have aluminum oxide on them are considered to be distinct portions; the aluminum portion of the sheet is considered to be a distinct aluminum portion; the lubricant is concentrated on the periphery of the die hole where the punch cuts through the aluminum portion as shown in figure 1, and each location about the periphery of the die hole is considered to be a specific location on the periphery of the die hole.

Tsubota does not teach the die hole having an open upper end and defining a periphery around the open end; and delivering a lubricant to the periphery of the open upper end of the die hole.

Lyon teaches a die hole having an open upper end 37 and defining a periphery around the open end; and delivering a lubricant to the periphery of the open upper end of the die hole for reducing heat. See Fig. 1.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate an open upper end as taught by Lyon to the Tsubota's die to reducing heat.

7. Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Tsubota in view of Lyon (2,821,156), as applied to claim 65 above, and further in view of Klint et al (3,288,715), hereafter Klint.

Tsubota discloses everything as noted above, but does not disclose delivering a partially fluorinated fluid, however, Klint teaches delivering a partially fluorinated fluid in column 2, lines 2-4.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to deliver a partially fluorinated fluid in Tsubota as taught by Klint in order to obtain a bright surface on the fabricated aluminum.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 02/13/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that the modified method of forming an electrode layer for a flat capacitor of Tsubota does not teach the pre-determined location having more lubricant than other locations on the periphery. This argument is not persuasive.

The vertical surface of the upper section of the die hole 7, which is the pre-determined location, has a greater area than the horizontal surface of the mid-section of the die hole 7, which is the other location. Since the pre-determined location has a greater area, it holds more

lubricant. Therefore, the pre-determined location has more lubricant than the other location on the periphery.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 65 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHONG H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-4510. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 3724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy V Eley/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724

/P. H. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 3724
May 13, 2008